

R E M A R K S

Claims 1 and 3-28 are currently pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended herein. New claims 29-34 are presented for consideration.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-15, 17 and 21-28 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly obvious over Kessler in view of Kawamura and Hamai. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly obvious over Kessler, Hamai and Kawamura and further in view of Mizushima. Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly obvious over Kessler, Hamai and Kawamura and further in view of Parrish. Claims 16 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as allegedly obvious over Kessler, Hamai and Kawamura and further in view of Smith.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-28, and favorable consideration of new claims 29-34 are requested.

Independent claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended to recite a first channel for supplying fuel from a fuel tank to the spraying means and a second channel for flowing fuel therethrough from the spraying means to the first channel. These independent claims further recite an intermittently operating valve disposed in the second channel. This structure is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references. Instead, at best, the cited references disclose locating a valve in the first channel. When the valve is located in the first channel, combustion of the sprayed fuel may be unstable and cause unwanted noise. By locating the valve in the second channel, as recited in the amended claims, pressure fluctuations of the fuel spray may be reduced, thus stabilizing combustion and avoiding excessive noise. None of the cited references, taken alone or in combination,

discloses or suggests this recited structure. Therefore, the rejection of independent claims 1, 8 and 13 should be withdrawn.


Independent claim 22 recites similar structure instead replacing terms "channel" and "return channel" for first and second channels respectively. Therefore, for similar reasons to those presented above, this rejection should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3-7, 9-12, 14-21 and 23-34 depend from and more specifically recite the structure of independent claims 1, 8, 13 and 22 and further distinguish over the cited art. Therefore, the rejection of dependent claims 2 and 3 should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-28, favorable consideration of new claims 29-34, and allowance of the case are requested.

The extra claim fee of \$300.00 is enclosed. Please charge any additional fees to our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: 